

The court has conducted a *de novo* review of the objections in relation to the pleadings and the applicable law. After careful consideration, the court concludes the objections are without merit. Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that the state court's rejection of his grounds for review was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law. Nor has he demonstrated that the state court's decision was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence. As a result, petitioner is not entitled to federal habeas relief. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

## ORDER

Accordingly, the objections filed by petitioner (#32) are **OVERRULED**. The findings of fact and conclusions of law of the magistrate judge are correct and the report of the magistrate judge (#31) is **ADOPTED**. A final judgment will be entered denying the petition.

Furthermore, petitioner is not entitled to the issuance of a certificate of appealability. An appeal from a final judgment denying habeas relief may not proceed unless a certificate of appealability is issued. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253. The standard for a certificate of appealability requires the petitioner to make a substantial showing of the denial of a federal constitutional right. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000); *Elizalde v. Dretke*, 362 F.3d 323, 328 (5th Cir. 2004). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner need not establish that he would prevail on the merits. Rather, he must demonstrate that the issues raised in the petition are subject to debate among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner, or that the questions presented are worthy of encouragement to proceed further. *See Slack*, 529 U.S. at 483-84. Any doubt regarding whether to grant a certificate of appealability should be resolved in favor of the petitioner, and the severity of the penalty may be considered in making this determination. *See Miller v. Johnson*, 200 F.3d 274, 280-81 (5th Cir. 2000).

In this case, the petitioner has not shown that the issue of whether his grounds for review are meritorious is subject to debate amongst jurists of reason. The factual and legal questions raised by petitioner have been consistently resolved adversely to his position and the questions presented are not worthy of encouragement to proceed further. Petitioner has failed to make a sufficient showing to merit the issuance of a certificate of appealability. Thus, a certificate of appealability will not be issued.

SIGNED at Beaumont, Texas, this 14th day of July, 2025.



---

MARCIA A. CRONE

2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE